

## **1. FLAG SALUTE & CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE**

Vice Chairman Eli Rennert called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance and Ally Morris read the Certification of Compliance with the NJ Open Public Meetings Act:

“The time, date and location of this meeting was published in the *Asbury Park Press* and posted on the bulletin board in the office of the Township of Lakewood at least 48 hours in advance. The public has the right to attend this meeting, and reasonable comprehensive minutes of this meeting will be available for public inspection. This meeting meets the criteria of the Open Public Meetings Act.”

## **2. ROLL CALL**

Mr. Garfield, Mr. Sabel, Mr. Flancbaum, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Meyer

## **3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS**

Mr. Terence Vogt, P.E., P.P., C.M.E. was sworn.

## **4. MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS**

- 1. SD 2395 Bais Reuven Kamenetz of Lakewood Inc**  
Ridge Avenue Block 190.04, Lot 8.01  
Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create 16 lots

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

- 2. SP 2325 Bais Reuven Kamenetz of Lakewood Inc**  
Ridge Avenue Block 190.04, Lot 8.01  
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a school

Mr. Sabel said the resolution indicates the applicant could pick up an additional 5 or 6 spaces but there was discussion that it was 20 additional spaces.

Ms. Morris said her notes indicate it should be 20 spaces as well.

Mr. Sabel recalls there were a few other items which are also not included in the resolution.

Ms. Morris said additional items which should be incorporated into the resolution include simcha hall must be reduced by 300 sf, applicant will add 20 more spaces.

Mr. Flannery said the 20 extra spaces were for overflow parking so it is not going to be a regular parking lot.

Ms. Morris said the lunchroom may not be rented out, the applicant will petition the County for a turning lane, an 8 ft fence will be provided around the pool, sidewalk will be provided from the roadway to the school.

Mr. Sabel said if anything else was indicated in the minutes then that should be included as well.

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

**3. SP 2134A 3G Corporation**

605 East County Line Road Block 172.01, Lot 1  
Amended Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for an additional retail building

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

**4. SD 2118A Yehoshua Frenkel**

River Avenue & Blueberry Court Block 524, Lots 7.02-7.04  
Minor Subdivision to consolidate three lots

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

**5. SP 2299 Yehoshua Frenkel**

River Avenue & Blueberry Court Block 524, Lots 7.02-7.04  
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a commercial building

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

**6. SD 2386 Joseph Ginsberg**

922 & 937 East Co Line & Somerset Ave B 174.11, L 34.03-34.05, 37.01, & 37.02  
Minor Subdivision to adjust lot lines and Site Plan Exemption for existing synagogue to remain

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

**7. SP 2320 Cong Kehillas Raintree Inc**

1371 & 1373 Alvarado Avenue Block 187, Lots 62 & 63  
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for an addition to an existing synagogue

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

## **5. PUBLIC HEARING**

**1. SP 2324 Yeshiva Gedolah Keren Hatorah**

1083 Brook Road Block 174.01, Lot 47  
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan for an addition to an existing school

*A review letter prepared by Remington & Vernick Engineers dated August 19, 2019 was entered as an exhibit.*

Mr. Vogt said there is a pre-existing non-conforming front yard setback variance on the property with respect to Imperial Court, a maximum building coverage variance, testimony shall be provided as to the adequacy of parking as they do not have full architectural floor plans. The site plans indicate 17 spaces and the applicant's professionals will have to justify that meets UDO or seek the appropriate relief. A buffer variance is necessary with respect to the residential uses, off-street parking setback variances are also required. A design waiver is required for street trees along Imperial Court due to the presence of mature trees, this waiver is supported. Finally, a design waiver is required from providing sidewalk along the frontage of Imperial Court.

Mr. Glenn Lines, P.E., P.P. was sworn.

*Mr. Raitzik arrived at the meeting.*

Mr. Lines said this is an existing school building which extends approximately 100 ft from Brook Road. There is existing parking to the north of the building and to the north of this site is the JCP&L power easement with the high-tension wires, a lot owned by the Township and beyond that is the Metedeconk River. To the south of this property is Imperial Court which was constructed after this building was constructed so what they view the side property line of 49.33 ft is now a front setback of 49.5 ft which is an existing condition. The proposed plan is to demolish 2,000 sf of the existing building and build a 9,678 sf addition. The first floor would be bathrooms, coat rooms, a Bais Medrash and the second floor would be three classrooms and some office space. Overall the building requires 19 parking spaces but they do not have existing architectural plans to prove that. The applicant has submitted a letter to the board indicating that 19 is the correct number.

Mr. Adam Pfeffer, Esq. said therefore, they are not seeking any parking variances.

Mr. Vogt said that if the board acts favorably, the applicant would have to prove during compliance that the parking meets UDO or they would have to come back before the board.

Mr. Lines said they are proposing 5 new parking spaces in the front and there are 14 existing spaces.

Mr. Garfield asked where those new spaces are proposed to be located.

Mr. Lines said right along Brook Road, there will be 4 regular spaces and 1 handicap space. Three buses are expected for this school which would come at staggered intervals. There is only room for 1 bus so they would have to work out timing in order to accommodate that.

Mr. Rennert asked him to address the off-street parking setback variance.

Mr. Lines said a 20 ft buffer is required on the north side of the site. The existing driveway, which comes in off Brook Road and services the back of the property, is within the 20 ft buffer. A waiver is being requested due to the existing driveway and they would be buffering themselves from the JCP&L power right-of-way. There are no residential properties on that side.

Mr. Rennert asked him to discuss the sidewalk waiver along Imperial Court.

Mr. Lines said Imperial Court is a small cul-de-sac which was built 15 to 20 years ago. When it was constructed, sidewalks were installed on the south side of the street where the houses are located and it goes up, around the cul-de-sac and ends at the tree line. The board at that time did not require the applicant to install sidewalks along the other side. A waiver is being requested from providing sidewalks and they propose to provide an 8 ft high vinyl fence from the setback line all the way along the property line and a 4 ft high vinyl fence out to the sight triangle for the County. He does not believe it is necessary to install sidewalks along that side as there are already sidewalks provided on the side with residential housing. Similar with shade trees, there are existing trees there and there may not be room for additional trees as the existing trees are large, mature trees. All of the trees would be on the inside of the vinyl fence.

Mr. Pfeffer asked him to address the lot coverage variance.

Mr. Lines said they propose a lot coverage of 31.26% whereas 30% is permitted. Basically, they are approximately 1,200 sf over the permitted lot coverage for the building.

Mr. Sabel asked if there is a basement.

Mr. Lines said yes, it is an unfinished basement.

Mr. Rennert said it would not be used for a simcha hall.

Mr. Lines said no, they are not proposing any improvements.

Mr. Rennert opened to the public.

Mr. Klein, 189 Chateau Drive, was sworn. He asked that the waiver from providing sidewalk not be granted by the board as there are safety concerns.

Mr. Rennert closed to the public.

Mr. Sabel asked that sidewalks or a walking path be provided on the property to ensure the students enter and exit safely to and from the school to the bus loading/unloading area. *(difficult to hear)*

Mr. Lines agreed.

Mr. Garfield asked if additional stormwater would be provided.

Mr. Lines said yes, a recharge basin is proposed under the front parking lot which would take care of both the addition and parking area.

Ms. Morris said the board has not acted on the submission waivers. The architectural plans for the existing buildings are one of the waivers requested.

Mr. Vogt said one of their recommendations at the beginning was based on the applicant indicating that they are not seeking parking relief. If the board acts favorably, the applicant would have to provide architectural information during compliance for the entire facility and would have to prove that it meets UDO parking requirements.

Mr. Sabel wants to ensure the students are walking on sidewalk and not in the driveway or roadway as there is a dormitory on the site.

Mr. Lines said they would provide door locations and some documentation as to how many bedrooms and classrooms there are to support the 19 parking spaces.

Mr. Rennert asked what kind of buffer is currently there between the site and the JCP&L property.

Mr. Lines said it is wide open to the Township property.

Mr. Flancbaum asked if the applicant would agree to provide a 6 ft high chain link fence, so the boys don't wander onto that property. There really is a safety issue as there are power lines on that property.

Mr. Pfeffer said the applicant would agree to provide a chain link fence.

Mr. Vogt said it should be stipulated in the resolution that the final site plans would have interior sidewalk to the access ways for both the existing and the proposed building.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application and submission waivers.  
All were in favor.

**2. SP 2331 Khal Birchas Shimon**  
603 Ocean Avenue Block 189, Lot 173  
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan for a synagogue

*A review letter prepared by Remington & Vernick Engineers dated August 19, 2019 was entered as an exhibit.*

Mr. Vogt said submission waivers are requested for a traffic study as the applicant's engineer indicates that the project is only for a residence with a small local synagogue, topography, contours and man-made features within 200 ft, plans/profiles of proposed utility layouts and an environmental impact statement are supported as noted.

The board granted the waivers as recommended by the Board Engineer and Planner.

Mr. Vogt said testimony shall be provided as to parking and whether spaces are proposed within the desired typical section, relief is also required with respect to the perimeter buffer. Design waivers are requested for the driveway width as well as the location of the driveway with respect to the Route 88 right-of-way.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn. Exhibit A-1 is sheet 3 of the site plan submitted which shows the building and parking layout, A-2 is sheet 53 of the tax map. This property is located at the corner of North Oakland Avenue and Route 88 and if the board recalls, this shul was originally proposed on Somerset and Linden Avenues which the public was in favor of but it was in the wrong area, so they are back before the board with a shul in a more appropriate location. It is located on a corner so the impact is limited, 17 parking spaces are being provided. No simcha hall is being proposed and there will be a playroom in the basement. There is no access to the shul to that part of the basement and this is an established Rabbi who will be using this for himself and for his family to visit. It is his testimony that the 17 spaces for the 1,677 sf sanctuary meets the ordinance. The engineer's report points out that it is a residence so an additional 4 spaces may be required but he believes it is an accessory use to the shul, but he would ask for that variance out of caution. They could squeeze in a few more spaces but he does not believe it would be helpful as more people will be backing out. This is a neighborhood where people will walk and will know how many parking spaces are available. The applicant feels this is an appropriate location for this shul and has met with the neighbors.

Mr. Flancbaum asked if there will be a kiddish.

Rabbi Isaac Sternheim was sworn. Next to the men's room, in the basement there is a warming kitchen for the kiddish upstairs. It is only used to keep food warm downstairs.

Mr. Rennert asked where additional spaces could be added.

Mr. Flancbaum said they could add a spot to the north and a spot to the south. He does not recommend adding those spaces as they currently will have 5 cars backing out already.

Mr. Rennert would like to see those additional spaces.

Mr. Sabel is in favor of adding those additional spaces.

Mr. Pfeffer said the applicant has no objection adding those two spaces.

Mr. Vogt said there is a utility and access easement shown along the northern property border.

Mr. Flannery said the easement is to the other lot.

Mr. Vogt believes it will be problematic. If the board acts favorably, they would need to look at the feasibility of putting up to 2 parking spaces there. If they find it conflicts with that northerly access, they may have to cut that back.

Mr. Rennert questioned the spaces being within the desired typical section.

Mr. Flannery said there is a 3 ft overhang into the desired typical section and there is not a requirement from the NJDOT as to placing parking in a desired typical section. The NJDOT typical section incorporates a border area which would be sidewalk, grass, etc. Their manual indicates the section is larger than what they would need. Route 88 was widened recently so he does not expect any additional widening but if it did happen, there is another lane which could be added without impacting those spaces. The spaces could be designated for compact cars only as a typical length is 16 ft whereas they are providing 18 ft. Relief is required from the 20 ft perimeter buffer. The applicant would provide a fence which meets the intent of the ordinance. He referenced sections in the Master Plan and MLUL to justify the variances requested. A design waiver is requested for a driveway being wider than 30 ft. If the board acts favorably, the approved subdivision would be vacated. The applicant would satisfy any remaining comments in the engineer's report. The applicant would agree to any reasonable recommendations made by the Shade Tree Commission and to comply with the ordinance.

Mr. Sabel requested that a sign be provided which indicates 'back in only' for the parking spaces but the majority of the board were not in favor.

Mr. Rennert opened to the public.

Mr. Klein was sworn. He commented the Rabbi is of good character.

Mr. Rennert closed to the public.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.  
All were in favor.

**3. SP 2336 Kollel Kinyan Torah Inc**  
Whitesville Road Block 251, Lot 1.04  
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan for a daycare

*A review letter prepared by Remington & Vernick Engineers dated August 19, 2019 was entered as an exhibit.*

Mr. Vogt said submission waivers are requested for topography, contours and man-made features within 200 ft, plans/profiles of proposed utility layouts and an environmental impact statement. The waivers are supported as noted.

The board granted the waivers as recommended by the Board Engineer and Planner.

Mr. Vogt said a variance is required for maximum building coverage and a design waiver is required for the buffer.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn. This application is for a daycare facility which is a permitted use in the zone. The plans indicate a 20 to 23% maximum building coverage is necessary but they would request a building coverage of 25%.

Mr. Rennert asked that they limit the coverage to 23% as that is what the plans indicate.

Mr. Flannery understands. The architect drew up the plans in order to come up with something that works not realizing they were over the maximum building coverage. The R-40 is the only zone in Lakewood which is limited to 20% coverage so a typical daycare in any other zone would be allowed 25 or 30%. A design waiver is also requested with respect to the 25 ft wide buffer. The applicant would provide fencing and landscaping to meet the intent of the ordinance. He referenced sections in the Master Plan and MLUL to justify the variances requested.

Mr. Rennert asked him to go through the parking calculations.

Mr. Flannery said the parking calculations for a daycare are not specific so they went with the closest use they could find which is the number of employees. The requirement per the number of employees would be 20 and they have provided 44 spaces.

Mr. Flancbaum asked how many spaces are required for the catering facility.

Mr. Flannery said if they use the calculation used for a shul, it would come out to 30 spaces.

Mr. Vogt said the catering facility is not a principal use, the catering is proposed to be off hours.

Mr. Rennert questioned if it is a permitted use.

Mr. Flannery said it is an accessory use to the daycare.

Mr. Jackson said schools and shuls have catering so that is a wide spread accessory use for those types of uses, not so much for a daycare.

Mr. Flannery said there are schools which provide daycare.

Mr. Pfeffer said the catering hall will be servicing the next application which is one property over.

Mr. Sabel does not think the board should be looking at these properties separately. They should be submitted as one application in order to see how everything functions together.

Mr. Jackson said if catering is not permitted in this zone then this board does not have the authority to approve it. It is not an accessory use, it is an additional use.

Ms. Morris does not believe they can combine these two separate applications as they are not contiguous.

Mr. Rennert said 44 spaces for a catering facility on Drake Road is not going to work.

Mr. Pfeffer said there is additional parking on the lot which is listed next on the agenda. The lots are under the same ownership.

Mr. Appel was sworn. He said there is a school on lot 1.06 with approximately 35 students. They would like to increase that number and all of the student's children go to the daycare on this lot. The simcha hall will be used for these children and it would be rented out. Generally, the children will be eating in their own rooms but they may use the basement as well from time to time. The basement will be used for a simcha hall which would be used as an accessory to the daycare and the school one lot over. The lot between is vacant land which they have been trying to purchase for some time.

Mr. Jackson said it is not a permitted use.

Mr. Pfeffer said the applicant would like to remove the catering facility portion and proceed only with the daycare.

Mr. Rennert asked what they propose to use the catering area for.

Mr. Flannery said it would be a playroom for the kids. The applicant will review the possibility of going to the Zoning Board for the catering portion.

Mr. Jackson said if the applicant shows that area as open space and would like to go to the Zoning Board at a later time to get that use approved, then that is acceptable. Until then, they are not permitted to use it and could get cited for it if they do.

Mr. Sabel would like to see revised plans.

Mr. Jackson said they could be provided before adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Rennert asked how many children would be in the daycare.

Mr. Flannery said about 220. There is a drop off area where it would be staggered drop offs. The predominant usage would be the school to the west.

Mr. Appel said the times are staggered in the morning between 8:45 to 9:30 am. There are about 84 spaces on the school site where the parents can park and walk about 50 ft to this site. Many of the parents will be remaining at the site as they attend the school.

Mr. Rennert asked how many cars could fit in the circular driveway.

Mr. Flannery said 15 or 16. There will also be 24 extra parking spaces.

Mr. Rennert opened to the public.

Mr. Klein was sworn. He is in support of this application as it is a licensed daycare.

Mr. Tikhner, 68 White Street, was sworn. He questioned what specific type of fence and/or landscaping is being proposed. He is also concerned about losing additional trees/landscaping.

Mr. Pfeffer said it would be a 6 ft high white vinyl fence.

Mr. Tikhner asked if the fence could be higher.

Mr. Abe Auerbach was sworn. They have no problem providing a fence but he needs to be aware that they would need to clear some trees. He does not suggest a fence higher than 6 ft as they tend to break easier.

Mr. Tikhner would like to see a fence but he would like to see a plan. He is also concerned about the garbage area and wants to make sure it is not backing up to his property.

Mr. Flannery said they would relocate it but they would have to eliminate some parking spaces.

Mr. Tikhner asked if the applicant meet with him concerning the fence and buffer.



Mr. Nussbaum was sworn. His family owns lot 1.05 and he is not in favor of this application as it will kill the chances of his lot becoming residential. There is a safety concern as people will be walking back and forth between the daycare and the school.

Mr. Chaim Abadi, 245 Miller Road, was sworn. He is in favor of the application.

Mr. Ari Holtz, 7 Corey Court, was sworn. He thanked the applicant for working with him.

Mr. Rennert closed to the public.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.

Affirmative: Mr. Garfield, Mr. Sabel

No: Mr. Rennert

Abstain: Mr. Flancbaum, Mr. Meyer

**4. SP 2335 Kollel Kinyan Torah Inc**

Whitesville Road Block 251, Lot 1.06

Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan for an educational center with dorms

A motion was made and seconded to carry the application to the September 24, 2019.

**5. SD 2399 Torah Education of America Inc.**

27, 37 & 45 Pawnee, 1732 & 1740 W Co Line Block 2, Lots 32, 46, 49, 52, & 53

Minor Subdivision to create four lots

**6. SP 2333 Torah Education of America Inc.**

27, 37 & 45 Pawnee, 1732 & 1740 W Co Line Block 2, Lots 32, 46, 49, 52, & 53

Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan for a school

*Review letters prepared by Remington & Vernick Engineers dated August 21, 2019 were entered as exhibits.*

Mr. Rennert stepped down for these applications.

Mr. Vogt said for the subdivision application, a variance is requested for minimum rear yard setback. Design waivers appear necessary from providing street trees along the project frontages as well as from providing sidewalk along the Pawnee Road frontage. For the site plan application, submission waivers are required for topography, contours and man-made features within 200 ft, plans/profiles of proposed utilities and from providing an environmental impact statement. The submission waivers are supported as noted. The phase 1 schematic architectural plan show a proposed residence on the second floor. Testimony shall be provided as to the purpose of the use and how it is permitted within the proposed overall use. A buffer variance is required with regard to the residential buffers, a variance is required for parking within the required buffer.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn. Exhibit A-1 is sheet 3 of the site plan which shows the building and parking, exhibit A-2 is the minor subdivision and A-3 is a copy of the tax map. Zoning relief requested for the minor subdivision is for a rear yard setback for lots 53.02 and 53.03. Rear yard setbacks of 5.08 ft and 16.11 ft are proposed, whereas 20 ft is required. The intent was to provide a suitable lot which would provide for the needs of the school and also leaving lots over 12,000 sf. The only people who would be impacted by this variance would be the owners and the school.

Mr. Sabel asked if these are existing homes.

Mr. Flannery said yes. The owners signed an agreement with the applicant so the board already has that information.

Mr. Garfield asked who owns these homes.

Mr. Brown said the homes are owned by the yeshiva.

Mr. Flannery said design waivers are being requested for the minor subdivision from providing street trees and sidewalk along Pawnee Road. This is an existing neighborhood and they respectfully request those waivers.

Mr. Sabel asked if there are existing sidewalks along Pawnee Road.

Mr. Brown said part of it has sidewalks.

Mr. Sabel questioned why a waiver is being requested from providing sidewalks.

Mr. Flannery said they are not changing anything with respect to the residential on Pawnee Road so they are requesting it.

Mr. Sabel would like sidewalks provided.

Mr. Brown said there is fencing separating the school from the residential dwelling. The boys do not use that as any means of ingress or egress so being that they come out to County Line Road, the issue with any design of this site would be on County Line Road rather than Pawnee Road. Pawnee is a residential neighborhood and it has been that way for long time and nothing is changing by way of this application.

Mr. Flannery said the applicant would satisfy any remaining comments in the engineer's report. The applicant would agree to any reasonable recommendations made by the Shade Tree Commission and to comply with the ordinance.

Mr. Sabel asked how many parking spaces currently exist for the residential units and how many are required.

Mr. Brown said one of the residences has about 8 spaces and the others have 3 or 4 each.

Mr. Flannery asked how many students currently attend the school and how many are proposed.

Mr. Brown said there are currently 91 students and the anticipated growth is 230.

Mr. Flannery said the site plan is for a two-story boy's high school with a finished basement. The proposed residence on the second floor is for the visiting Rabbi on weekends. It is his understanding that is not an unusual situation and it is certainly ancillary to the school use. A buffer variance is required with respect to the 20 ft buffer and they would provide fencing which they feel would satisfy the intent of the ordinance. A variance is also required for parking within that 20 ft buffer. He referenced sections in the Master Plan and MLUL to justify the variances requested. The applicant agrees to satisfy the rest of the comments in the engineer's review letter.

Mr. Vogt said there was a concern with some conflicting information in the traffic study as to the number of buses and start/dismissal times.

Mr. Flannery said there is the availability for 4 buses.

Mr. Vogt said that is for the future.

Mr. Flannery confirmed. The commencement and dismissal times as stated in the engineer's report are accurate. The applicant would agree to any reasonable recommendations made by the Shade Tree Commission and to comply with the ordinance.

Mr. Sabel questioned if children are staying in the apartment in the school as the architectural plans call out 'children's room #1 and #2'.

Mr. Brown said it is the testimony of the applicant that this is not an apartment is meant for continuous use. In this particular case, the purpose of this residential use is for a visiting staff member.

Mr. Garfield questioned circulation plan as to garbage pickup.

Mr. Flannery said they would have to obtain DPW approval. If they do not, the applicant would have to hire a private hauler.

Mr. Sabel asked if there is a simcha hall.

Mr. Brown said no.

Mr. Meyer asked how many students are driving.

Mr. Brown said at this point, all of the students are commuting. If the school evolves to have older boys, then they would make use of the proposed dormitory.

Mr. Sabel asked if they are requesting approval for both phases.

Mr. Flannery said yes. The dormitory is proposed for phase 2.

Mr. Flancbaum asked how many boys are proposed to occupy the dormitory.

Mr. Flannery said 60 to 70. The plan is shown in phases because they are only going to build the first phase now but they are seeking approval for both phases.

Mr. Brown said there are 130 students proposed for the high school and an additional 60 for the post high school.

Mr. Flancbaum asked how many dormitory rooms are proposed.

Mr. Brown said currently there are 90 students, the applicant hopes to grow the high school portion to 130 students. At a later date, the applicant hopes to grow to a post high school program which would have 60 students. The dormitory is designed for 60 students and before resolution compliance is signed off, the applicant would have to provide clear architectural plans which support the testimony provided.

Mr. Jackson said on the phase 2 plans, there is a basement which has a dining room, food storage, rec room, lounge, equipment storage, luggage storage and general storage. There is also a dining room in phase 1 as well. He questioned whether that much dining room is needed and if so, why.

Mr. Flannery said there is going to be a high school and a post high school so it is two separate facilities.

Mr. Brown thinks because it is two separate student bodies, it is appropriate to have two separate dining rooms.

Mr. Flannery said the dining rooms as shown are for those schools and it is not intended to be rented out.

Mr. Raitzik asked if the post high school students will be permitted to have their own cars.

Mr. Flannery said no.

Mr. Sabel is concerned about the two large dining rooms and what could possibly happen in the future. He wants to make sure there is not overflow parking on County Line Road.

Mr. Vogt said all of the site improvements are proposed in phase 1 so when they are talking about phasing, they are not talking about site development, they are talking about the construction of the buildings.

Mr. Flannery confirmed.

Mr. Vogt said the applicant would have to satisfy the UDO requirements as to parking for all of the phases.

Mr. Brown said the applicant has indicated that there are no intentions to rent out the dining rooms as a simcha hall. They are not designed as such so there is no reason to assume otherwise.

Mr. Raitzik questioned the timetable for phase 1 and phase 2.

Mr. Brown said they would like to start phase 1 right away and phase 2 would be between 2 and 5 years.

Mr. Raitzik asked if the post high school is planned for next year.

Mr. Brown said no.

Mr. Flancbaum said the dorms are actually proposed in phase 3. Phase 1 is existing, phase 2 is the high school and phase 3 is the post high school.

Mr. Brown said the phasing is a bit confusing but the applicant is simply presenting it as such because the applicant wants the board to understand that they are starting with phase 1, phase 2 is not happening yet and the building department should be aware as well.

Mr. Sabel said the board is granting variances for this application and they want to ensure additional parking is not going to be on County Line Road.

Mr. Brown said it is impossible to park on County Line and it doesn't make sense to propose it. The applicant is willing to state there is no chance there is going to be a simcha hall because it doesn't work.

Mr. Meyer opened to the public.

Mr. Klein was sworn. He thanked the board for requiring sidewalks on Pawnee Road. The board should approach the Township Committee as to parking not being required for schools with simcha halls.

Mr. Meyer closed to the public.

A motion made and seconded to approve the subdivision application. The design waiver from providing sidewalk along Pawnee Road was not granted.

All were in favor.

Mr. Sabel asked that sidewalks be provided from the east and west side of the building out to the sidewalk on County Line Road.

Mr. Flannery agreed.

Mr. Flancbaum asked if a fence is being provided along lot 50.

Mr. Flannery believes there is a fence shown on the plans, if not, the applicant would agree to provide a fence.

Mr. Sabel said the dining rooms would not be rented out for events.

A motion made and seconded to approve the site plan application.

All were in favor.

- 7. SP 2330 Yeshivas Sharei Binas Inc**  
319, 323, 327 Ocean Ave, Ocean Ave Block 246, Lots 40, 41, 42.01, & 67 (approved Lot 40.03)  
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan for a school

A motion was made and seconded to carry the application to the September 24, 2019.

- 8. SD 2392 Leonard S. Coopersmith**  
50 Amherst Street & 101 Rutgers Drive Block 1051.01, Lots 36 & 37  
Minor Subdivision to create three lots

A motion was made and seconded to carry the application to the September 24, 2019.

- 6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
- 7. APPROVAL OF BILLS**
- 8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted  
Sarah L. Forsyth  
Planning Board Recording Secretary